

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Michael Washington,)
Plaintiff,) Case No.: 2:20-cv-01854-GMN-NJK
vs.)
Daniel Lippmann, *et al.*,)
Defendant.)
ORDER

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 8), of United States Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe, which states that this case should be dismissed without prejudice.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed. (See Min. Order,

1 ECF No. 8) (setting a February 5, 2021, deadline for objections).¹


2 Accordingly,

3 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 8), is
4 **ADOPTED** in full.

5 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED without prejudice**.

6 The Clerk is instructed to close the case.

7 Dated this 8 day of February, 2021.

8
9
10 
Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge
United States District Court

23
24 ¹ The Court notes that Plaintiff filed a Supplement to his Complaint, (ECF No. 10), but no objection to the
Report and Recommendation. Even if the Court construes the Supplement as an Objection, Plaintiff has not
cured the defects identified in the Report and Recommendation under the *Younger* abstention doctrine because
he has not demonstrated the extraordinary circumstances required for the Court to intervene in a pending state
proceeding. See *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 53–54 (1971).